DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 745 HE 015 036

AUTHOR	Douglas, Joel M., Ed.
TITLE	[Unionization on Campus].
INSTITUTION	City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Bernard Baruch Coll. National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.
PUB DATE	Jan 82
NOTE	9p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10010.
JOURNAL CIT	National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions Newsletter; v10 n1 Jan-Feb 1982
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; *Contracts; *Court Litigation; Employment Practices; Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; Librarians; State Colleges; Teaching Conditions; Time; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS	*California State University and Colleges; *National Labor Relations Board v Yeshiva Univ

ABSTRACT

This newsletter issue considers in separate articles: (1) unionization in 1981 among college faculty in the United States; (2) unionization at the California State University and College System (CSU) (by Lisa Flanzraich); (3) multi-year agreements; (4) contract size; (5) and, in "Yeshivawatch," developments pertaining to the National Labor Relations Board v. Yeshiva University U.S. Supreme Court Case. The first article reports that eight first-time contracts were signed in 1981; however, the number of unionized college faculty is now at an all-time high. As of January 1, 1982, 140,960 faculty were under labor agreements with an additional 16,364 faculty belonging to duly certified bargaining units who have not negotiated labor agreements. Nearly all the organizing activity conducted by the three major agents occurred in California. Flanzraich considers unionization at CSU after nearly 4 years of intense union organizing, and suggests that unionization of over 20,000 faculty, librarians, and academic administrators represents a formidable bloc in higher education policies. Important issues at CSU include an increased faculty workload, a larger student/faculty ratio, and the status of part-time faculty. The third article considers the relative merits of single versus multi-year agreements. A recent survey of 116 faculty contracts in effect as of July 1, 1981, showed that two-thirds of the agreements were for a contract period of three or more years. In another assessment, 253 agreements were categorized as either small (pocket) size, medium (book) size, or large. Finally, in regard to the Yeshiva decision, it is suggested that the case continues to play a dominant role in faculty collective bargaining, and that future Yeshiva claims are likely to take a more qualitative rather than a quantitative approach. (SW)

ED217745

NEWSLETTER - National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions.

Published at Baruch College - City University of New York. Vol 10, No. 1.

Jan/Feb 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCSCBHEP

CUNY/Baruch College

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE015036

NEWSLETTER
NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE PROFESSIONS

Published at Baruch College • City University of New York • Vol. 10, No. 1 • Jan./Feb. 1982

UNIONIZATION AMONG COLLEGE FACULTY — 1981

Bifurcated union organizing, coupled with an uncertain legal environment, may have accounted, in part, for the significantly reduced number of newly-organized faculty bargaining units in 1981. Only two full-time faculty units elected bargaining agents, making this the lowest number of new certified units in the past decade. Furthermore, only eight "first time" contracts were signed in 1981, which represented a substantial reduction in this category. These were at Johnson County Community College, Kansas; Delaware State College, Delaware; Hawkeye Institute, Iowa; Curry College, Massachusetts; Simon Rock's Early College, Massachusetts; North Orange Community College, California; Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations, New York (New York City camps), and the University of Nebraska, Nebraska. The agreement in Nebraska was not a comprehensive one and included only economic terms and conditions. The North Orange agreement represented a structural change and contained two previously certified units at Cypress and Fullerton Colleges, which now bargain as one.

Despite the relatively few additions to the ranks of unionized campuses, the number of unionized college faculty is now at an all time high. As of January 1, 1982, NCSCBHEP statistics show 140,960 faculty under labor agreements with an additional 16,364 faculty belonging to duly certified bargaining units who have not negotiated labor agreements for a grand total of 157,324. With the expected election of a bargaining agent in the California State University (CSU) in 1982, and a projected slower-than-usual union growth rate the number of unionized faculty in higher education will probably approach 200,000 by 1983.

Nearly all the organizing activity conducted by the three major agents, AAUP, AFT, and NEA occurred in California, where a bargaining agent election was held in December 1981, for the more than 19,000 faculty in CSU. Although the returns necessitated a run-off election, scheduled for April 1982, the results of the first ballot clearly indicated an overwhelming vote for faculty unionization and collective bargaining as nearly 80% of the votes cast supported an agent preference.

Mixed election results occurred at the University of California System where faculty at the Santa Cruz campus (54%) voted in favor of the AAUP, while at the University of California, Los Angeles a narrow majority (51%) of those voting preferred "No-Agent." Faculty at the University of Minnesota at Minneapolis-St. Paul rejected collective bargaining by more than a 2:1 ratio as "No-Agent" was the choice over the NEA and AAUP, while at Broward Community College, Florida, faculty voted to unionize and selected the UFF/AAUP as their bargaining agent.

In what some observers see as a significant development for the 1980's, successful organizing drives were conducted among adjunct faculty at two institutions. Bargaining units consisting solely of adjunct faculty were established at Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations (New York City campus) and Rhode Island School of Design. At Cornell, the union was involved in what may be construed as a recognition strike.

Changes in agent status were few, however, bargaining agent challenges were held at Riverside City College, California and Los Rios Community College, California. Faculty at both institutions chose to remain with their original agent. The bargaining unit at Salem College, West Virginia was decertified as a result of *Yeshiva*-related litigation. (See *NLRB v. Yeshiva University, 444* U.S. 672 (1980)). Faculty at the Detroit Institute of Technology lost their bargaining rights as well as their jobs when the institution closed. A challenge to the UFF/AFT was conducted at the University of Florida at Gainesville and Florida State University at Tallahassee where faculty, on a campus-by-campus basis, were given the choice to "opt-out"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Unionization Among College Faculty - 1981 .....p. 1
Unionization Wins at CSU .....p. 3
News and Notes .....p. 4
Multi-Year Agreements: A New Direction .....p. 5
The Enigma of Contract Size .....p. 6
YESHIVAWATCH .....p. 7
From the Bookshelf .....p. 7
Annual Conference .....p. 8

of their collective bargaining relationships. Faculty at both campuses chose to remain part of the systemwide bargaining unit. At the City University of New York, the PSC/AFT merged with the AAUP, while at the University of Pittsburgh the AAUP and the AFT explored a coalition arrangement for their forthcoming organizing drive.

Six strikes were reported at the outset of the 1981-82 academic year, two of which involved recognition stoppages by adjunct faculty seeking to either gain or strengthen their agent status. None of the "back-to-school" strikes identified could be directly linked to *Yeshiva* litigation; however, the stoppage at Wagner College in April did include *Yeshiva* issues. Adjunct strikes occurred at Cornell University/School of Industrial and Labor Relations (New York City campus) and the Community College of Philadelphia System, while stoppages involving full-time faculty took place at Delaware County Community College, PA, Montgomery County Community College, PA, Dowling College, NY and the University of Dubuque, IA. The number of "back-to-school" strikes continue to decline from six to 1977, twelve in 1978, eleven in 1979 and eight in 1980.

NLRB v. Yeshiva:

Yeshiva-related litigation continued to play a dominant role in faculty collective bargaining. As of January 1, 1982, over forty private colleges and universities had exercised some type of *Yeshiva*-like claim. Additionally, two public universities, the University of Alaska and Witchita State University, sought extension of the *Yeshiva* doctrine to their institutions.

Post-*Yeshiva* employment relationships took a new format when local union chapters, who had either voluntarily or by administrative order lost their agent certification status, adopted "agreements" not based on either collective bargaining or traditional labor relations. These "agreements" were not labor contracts, nor were they based on the governing tenets of labor law, but instead were comprised of sections of former contracts, policy manuals, and faculty handbooks. In some instances, consent of the faculty senate is required prior to any change. Illustrative of this approach are the "agreements" at Drury College, MO, Daemen College, NY, and Mt. Vernon College, DC.

None of the forty *Yeshiva* cases were adjudicated nor did the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) dispose of any of the lead cases before it. Extensive unit clarification, unit determination and unfair labor practice hearings relating to *Yeshiva* issues were held throughout the year, however, none proved to be dispositive. It is expected that much of the NLRB backlog with respect to *Yeshiva* will be cleared in 1982.

While it is still too early to chart the direction that future *Yeshiva* claims might take, early indications appear to support a more qualitative rather than a quantitative approach. It is likely that the so-called "ninety per cent rule" will fall and that greater emphasis will be placed on the quality of the decision and the decision making process itself rather than a mere tabulation of committee votes. As an example, greater weight will be given to faculty participation in the decision making process affecting tenure and promotion as opposed to a voice in the marketing of a new college brochure. If this type of approach is followed then colleges exercising *Yeshiva* like claims will be forced to submit their entire internal governance mechanisms to microscopic examination in hopes of convincing the NLRB of the merits of their claim.

No enabling legislation with respect to academic collective bargaining was passed this year although several states have reintroduced bills seeking to expand collective bargaining rights for college faculty.

As in the past, public sector institutions continue to be in the forefront of collective bargaining in higher education. Of the 382 contracts in existence, 313 are in public colleges and universities. All indications are that this trend will continue as private sector organizing appears to be at a standstill. Sixty nine contracts were identified, however, the status of several of them are in doubt pending the disposition of *Yeshiva* claims. The number of private sector unionized institutions continues to remain relatively static.

Fewer bargaining agents without negotiated contracts were reported this year than in the past eight. This might be attributed to the relatively low growth rate in newly organized units, as the overall maturing of the collective bargaining relationships between the parties. Of the forty agents identified this year without contracts many are at small institutions and in several instances represent situations where an agent was elected several years ago with little chance now being given of a negotiated contract ever being put into effect.

While it is still far too early to predict what the campus bargaining scene will resemble in January of 1983, it is apparent that, once again, the election results at CSU and the NLRB actions with respect to *Yeshiva* will continue to play dominant roles.

Finally, it must be emphasized that academic collective bargaining does not operate in an economic vacuum and whichever direction contract negotiations take in private industry the results will spillover to collective bargaining in higher education. One thing is certain—the future will be challenging and creative solutions will have to be found to solve todays' problems with tomorrow's resources.

NATIONAL CENTER NEWSLETTER

A publication of the National Center issued five times during the year. Annual subscription rate: $20; single copy, $4.00; free to Center members. Back issues available.

Editor and Director of the Center: Joel M. Douglas

Executive Assistant to the Director: Evan G. Mitchell

Administrative Assistant: Ruby N. Hill

Librarian: Lisa Flanzraich

Research Assistants: Bennett Gordon, Steven Kramer, Alan Rosenberg

Address inquiries and contributions to the National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions, Baruch College, 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010. Telephone: (212) 725-3390.

UNIONIZATION WINS AT CSU

Run-off Elections will decide the Faculty and two support staff unions

by Lisa Flanzraich

After nearly four years of intense union organizing, the long-awaited results of the election to choose a bargaining agent by the faculty of the California State University and College System (CSU) resulted in an overwhelming victory for unionization. Although neither union received the necessary amount of votes to be certified as the bargaining agent, union advocacy received approximately 80 percent of the total votes cast. Only 49 votes separated the ballot count between the two rivals (UPC - 6315, CFA - 6267). A run-off election has been scheduled for April 1982 between the United Professors of California/AFT (UPC) and the Congress of Faculty Associations/NEA/AAUP (CFA).

The preference of 2,400 faculty members who originally voted "No Representative" will decide the winner in what is considered to be the largest unorganized public sector statewide faculty unit. Faculty who supported "No-Agent" will have to opt for either side, should they choose to vote, since the "No-Agent" choice will not be on the ballot. At stake will be the exclusive representational rights of this public university system that has 20,000 faculty, 300,000 students, 19 campuses, and a budget in excess of one billion dollars.

Other employees within CSU also voted for unionization. In a somewhat surprising outcome, the Union of American Physicians and Dentists easily won bargaining rights against UPC for the 140 member unit of physicians. By a vote of 83 to 3, these professionals joined their faculty colleagues in expressing strong desire for collective bargaining. Allied health care professionals and nurses also overwhelmingly voted for unionization. Although "No-Agent" received 41 votes, nearly 80 percent of the eligible votes cast supported collective bargaining. A run-off election between California State Employees Association (CSEA) and UPC will be held in the 300 member Health Care Support unit. A run-off election is also scheduled for the academic support unit where nearly 87 percent of the electorate expressed their support for unionization.

Unions were also elected in the skilled crafts unit, clerical and administrative services, and operations support services units. CSEA won elections in operations support services and clerical and administrative services. It competed with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) for the administrative support unit and was the sole agent in the OSU unit. In skilled crafts, the State Employees Trade Council (SETC) won over CSEA and the International Union of Operating Engineers.

Set against the background of Proposition 13, stagflation, and Reaganomics, the unionization of over 20,000 faculty, librarians, and academic administrators represents a formidable bloc in higher education politics. Unions have argued that since the CSU budget was changed from a curriculum-based model to an enrollment-based model faculty workload has increased by almost 20 percent, while the student/faculty ratio has been raised by 12 percent. This argument was used by the unions in their successful organizing drives.

The status of part-time faculty within CSU has been a controversial issue. CFA had favored the creation of two distinct units, while UPC had urged the inclusion of adjuncts in the full-time faculty body. With the ruling by State PERB that a single unit was more appropriate (State PERB reversed earlier ruling calling for separate units), many believed that the adjunct vote would tip the balance. However, the percentage of adjunct votes was less than expected. Adjuncts comprise approximately half the teaching staff and instruct over one-quarter of all courses.

CFA had argued that since part-timers have different interests and concerns than tenure-track faculty, two bargaining councils would be appropriate. The CFA charter, however, mandates adjunct representation on the negotiations team. The UPC, in arguing for one systemwide faculty unit, maintained that diversified interest groups generally have less success and that a unified faculty would achieve more. Either way, the newly certified union will have to address the issues affecting adjunct faculty. They are considered by both groups to be poorly paid and, as a class, to lack job security and a voice in campus governance. Their professional stature is hampered by their part-time status. Recently referred to as "freeway gypsies," part-timers have teaching assignments that require them to travel from campus to campus.

Both the AFT and the NEA/AAUP offer distinct selling points to their constituents with respect to organizational structure. CFA, which is a coalition of NEA, AAUP and CSEA, has campaigned on the independent unit concept, which it claims is indigenous to campus bargaining and reflects shared governance modes and the need for strong academic senates. CFA claims sponsorship of the first draft of the California Higher Education Employee/Employer Relations Act (HEERA). UPC maintains that its cohesiveness as the united group of professors and professionals, rather than as a coalition of separate groups, increases its leverage as a bargaining agent. Its affiliation with AFT/AFL-CIO demonstrates lobbying power and perceived support in the state legislature.

The support that AAUP can be expected to offer NEA will be a crucial factor in swaying the votes of those who voted "No-Agent." It is predicted that large numbers of "No-Agent" votes will favor AAUP because of its image as a professional faculty association of long standing.

Exactly what effects collective bargaining at CSU will have remains to be seen. Unionization will formalize relationships and delineate respective roles to both administrators and faculty. Shared governance will undergo strains as the newness and uniqueness of the system is worked through. The negotiated contract will probably not take effect until late 1983 and with large cuts predicted in state funding, the negotiations process will be carefully watched.

TABLE ONE

California State University and College System Bargaining Agent
ELECTION RESULTS

UNIT	BARGAINING AGENT		Votes Received	Challenged Ballots	Void Ballots	Total Valid Ballots	Total Ballots Mailed	% of Votes Cast
Faculty	United Professors of California/American Federation of Teachers	R	6316					
	Cong. of Fac. Assoc. (CFA, NEA, AAUP, CSEA)	R	6267					
	No Representative		2400	441	28	15424	19329	80
Physicians	Union of American Physicians & Dentists	*	83					
	United Professors of California		3					
	No Representative		19	1	0	106	140	76
Health Care Support	California State Employees Association	R	96					
	United Professors of California	R	64					
	Retail Clerks		14					
	No Representative		41	2	2	217	279	78
Academic Support	United Professors of California	R	505					
	California Faculty Association	R	391					
	No Representative		123	12	2	1031	1335	77
Operations Support Services	California State Employees Association	*	1128					
	No Representative		76	12	9	1140	2108	54
Skilled Crafts	State Employees Trade Council	*	346					
	California State Employees Association		224					
	Intl. Union of Operating Engineers		92					
	No Representative		22	7	10	691	815	85
Clerical & Admin. Support Services	California State Employees Association	*	2000					
	American Federation of State County & Municipal Employees		1117					
	No Representative		700	40	0	3857	6670	58
					TOTALS	22466	30676	73

*Winning Agent (subject to certification)
R Participant in Run-off Election
Source: NCSCBHEP Research

NATIONAL CENTER NEWS AND NOTES

1. The 1982 *Directory of Faculty Contracts and Bargaining Agents* will be available April 1, 1982. The *Directory*, Vol. 8, is the most complete version yet published and contains an updated statistical analysis featuring the growth of collective bargaining in higher education since 1974. One copy of the *Directory* is available free-of-charge to Center members; others may purchase it from the Center for ten dollars ($10.00) per copy.

2. The third in our Annual Conference Seminar series is scheduled for April 28, 1982 at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York City. As in the past, Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations is serving as our co-sponsor for this year's program entitled: "The Law and Practice of Employment Relationships." Topics to be discussed include: "Just Cause," "Termination at Will," "Nonrenewal," "Nonreappointment," and "Discipline." For further information, please contact the Center.

3. As contract negotiations time approaches, our readers are reminded of BRAIN which might prove to be useful at the bargaining table. Accuracy, fast turnaround time, economy and impartiality are among its definitive features. For further information, please contact the Center.

MULTI-YEAR AGREEMENTS: A NEW DIRECTION

If the effectiveness and the stability of collective bargaining can be measured by the duration of the contract period, then it may be said that academic collective bargaining is becoming a more efficient and, to an extent, a more stable and productive process. A recent survey of 115 faculty contracts, in full force and effect as of July 1, 1981, showed that two-thirds of such agreements were for a contract period of three or more years. (See Table No. 1) In addition, it is significant to note that the number of one-year agreements was minimal and furthermore based on discussions with negotiators few, if any, such agreements are curently being negotiated.

N = 115

TABLE ONE
DURATION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

	LENGTH OF CONTRACT				
COLLEGE	1 Year	2 Year	3 Year	4 or More Years	T
2 Year	2	29	45	8	84
4 Year	0	8	16	4	28
2/4 Year	0	0	2	1	3
Total	2	37	63	13	115
Public	2	31	52	9	94
Private	0	6	11	4	21
Total	2	37	63	13	115

SOURCE: NCSCBHEP

Table No. 2 sets forth the expiration dates of the agreements surveyed. It is interesting although perhaps not significant to note that the number of contracts expiring in June as opposed to August of any given year are approximately equal.

While the advantages and disadvantages of negotiating multi-year agreements are difficult to assess on the macro-level, several observations can be made as to the relative merits of single vs. multi-year agreements. Those advocates supporting the one-year agreement most often cite the uncertainty of the economic setting as their primary concern. They claim that for the parties to agree to a wage settlement beyond that of one year would be to conduct negotiations in an unpredictable and unsettled economic environment. Furthermore, they submit that even if one was to index salary data to a prearranged formula, this too would be unsatisfactory inasmuch as the mind set of the negotiators might be such that they would be negotiating from positions of weaknesses due to insufficient economic data. Other arguments most often used in support of the one-year agreement center around the relative strength of either the union or the administration vis-a-vis the perceived strength of the opposing group. Quite often management, embroiled in an unsatisfactory union relationship, might opt for a one-year agreement in hopes that the union will either be challenged or decertified. Conversely, faculty groups often tie their negotiation strategy to project a change of administrations and/or campus politics.

N = 115

TABLE TWO
CONTRACT EXPIRATION DATES

	MONTH OF EXPIRATION						
COLLEGE	June 1982	August 1982	June 1983	August 1983	June 1984	August 1984 and Beyond	T
2 Year	26	24	14	14	0	6	84
4 Year	5	12	7	2	0	2	28
2/4 Year	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Total	31	38	22	16	0	8	115
Public	26	30	20	13	0	5	94
Private	5	8	2	3	0	3	21
Total	31	38	22	16	0	8	115

SOURCE: NCSCBHEP

Supporters of multi-year agreements claim that the time factors, energy expended, as well as the increasing economic costs in the negotiation of collective agreements have risen so that to negotiate anything except a multi-year agreement is counterproductive. Indexing remains the most favored way of resolving the question of the multi-year wage increase with parties either negotiating provisions for cost-of-living formulas, parity increases, evergreen clauses or other such methods. Re-openers by mutual consent or at the request of either party is another way of resolving the question of second-year agreements.

The maturation of the collective bargaining relationship as well as the contract administration process, is another advantage in negotiating multi-year agreements. When both parties are aware that the newly executed contract will be in full force for the next two or three years, the pressure of constant negotiations is relieved and the parties can fully concentrate their energies in other areas.

While it is true that the collective bargaining process has experienced an increase in multi-year agreements, the vast majority of negotiated contracts are still for specific time periods. This concept of the fixed period contract has rarely been departed from and yet, perhaps in this time of economic decline and retrenchment, the time is ripe for a new proposal. An alternative to fixed duration contracts is the possibility that experimentation take place with respect to the automatic renewal of contracts for an unspecified time period. These agreements would remain in effect until such time as the parties jointly file a notice of intent to either amend or terminate said agreement. Thus, in essence, the continuous agreement will remain in full force and effect for extended periods of time and not repeatedly be negotiated *de novo*. Obviously, language would have to be included providing for prospective economic relief, as well as provisions for negotiating changes in the terms and conditions of employment consistent with external legal and/or environmental changes.

NCSCBHEP is interested in doing further projects concerning the length of negotiated contract periods and would appreciate being informed of any recent campus developments concerning continuous contract and contract duration.

THE ENIGMA OF CONTRACT SIZE

Industrial relations researchers have analyzed virtually every aspect of both the collective bargaining processs and the agreement itself as a means of further understanding the employment relationships between the parties. While we do not intend to dwell on their findings, we have recently undertaken a brief survey to ascertain what size the parties choose for the printed contract once it has been reduced to writing. At the outset, before one assumes that we have researched every other possible phase of academic collective bargaining, let us assure you that there is a degree of validity in this project inasmuch as it has often been claimed that the more militant and combative the collective bargaining relationship is, the smaller the size of the contract. The reasoning behind this assumption is that those who wish to make repeated reference to the contract will have it printed in pocket size so that it may easily be carried on one's person. While we realize the scientific validity of this premise is somewhat dubious, we thought our readers might be interested in in knowing the results of this survey.

We established three categories of contract size and then examined 253 Agreements to see in which grouping they belonged. Of the sample, only ten percent of the contracts were small enough to be considered pocket size. The largest grouping, consisting of over one-half of the sample, were large agreements which led one researcher to observe that to the academic, the critical size feature was the ability of the contract to fit into one's attache case. One- third of the agreements were in the medium or book-size category, too large to fit into one's pocket and too small to warrant proper file or attache space. These have mostly been relagated to book cases where their impact on contract administration is still unknown.

While the above information might not appear to be earth shattering, perhaps, this survey ought to be replicated in other occupational groupings to see if once again, academic collective bargaining is truly a unique phenomenon.

N = 253

TABLE ONE

CONTRACT SIZE

SIZE	N	%
Small (Pocket) (3½" – 5")	26	10
Medium (Book) (5" – 7")	87	35
Large (8½" – 11")	140	55

Source: NCSCBHEP

"YESHIVAWATCH"

As part of its ongoing research mission, the National Center has been monitoring and reporting events related to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *NLRB v. Yeshiva University*. Beginning with Volume 9, No. 3, the Center instituted an itemized column of colleges or universities which declared themselves "Yeshivaized" and we continued with Items 3-11 in Volume 9, No. 4.

At last count there were approximately thirty *Yeshiva*-type cases pending before the NLRB and although no time frame has been set forth for the disposition of these cases, it is expected that several of the more significant ones will be ruled upon before the end of the 1981-82 academic year. We will endeavor to continue to maintain our YESHIVAWATCH and keep our readers informed as to current developments.

(For a complete analysis of the *Yeshiva* decision, see Volume 8, No. 1 and Volume 9, No. 2.)

Item No. 13: *WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY* - The question of *Yeshiva* applicability in the public sector was recently ruled upon in Kansas when a PERB hearing officer issued a recommended order that *Yeshiva* was not applicable to Wichita State University. The issue arose during a unit determination hearing when the University moved to dismiss the union's petition claiming *Yeshiva*. The unit determination petition was filed by KHEA/NEA, however, when *Yeshiva* was raised the AAUP and the Faculty Senate were given intervenor status. A unit determination order has been issued, said unit consisting of all faculty, researchers, librarians and related personnel who engaged in their professional pursuits more than 50% of the time. No election petition has been filed by any faculty organization as of this date.

Item No. 14: *UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA* - The Alaskan Labor Relations Agency recently ordered that a *Yeshiva* claim, filed by the University of Alaska, be dismissed. (Case No. UA 80-2) The University had raised *Yeshiva* as an affirmative defense in conjunction with an organizing drive being conducted by the NEA. The University argued that an ". . . inherent conflict of interest . . ." existed as the faculty regulate themselves and ". . . are therefore the dominant influence in collective bargaining and they cannot bargain with themselves." Furthermore, the University submitted that the "bubble up" administrative process is in effect and that . . . "The faculty effectively now determine their teaching methodology; grading policies; admissions; retention and graduation policies; curriculum; faculty hiring; promotion and tenure; sabbatical; budget; research projects; and teaching load." The NEA argued that *Yeshiva* is inapplicable to Alaskan law and that Alaska has no management exclusion in its statute. The Labor Relations Agency ruled that "*Yeshiva* does not apply to the U of A and that if faculty were to be considered managers . . . they would be entitled to a manager's unit . . ." Furthermore, it stated ". . . there is no conflict of interest among the faculty that precludes the formation of a bargaining unit."

Item No. 15: *DAEMEN COLLEGE* - The AAUP Chapter at Daemen voluntarily relinquished its bargaining agent certification status in exchange for an "understanding" that the faculty handbook will form the basis of the "employment relationship." The AAUP had been certified as the bargaining agent at this small New York State private college in 1979, however, no collective bargaining agreement has ever been negotiated. The college broke off contract talks with the union claiming *Yeshiva* and the parties have been in litigation since that time. The new procedure provides for faculty representation on the college's board of trustees and furthermore, mandates that the faculty handbook can be changed only with the consent of the faculty senate.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

In 1981 the National Center Library acquired many important publications in the field of academic collective bargaining. Listed below are some of our acquisitions as well as a review of one.

Soltow, Martha Jane and Jo Ann Stehberger Sokkar. *Industrial Relations and Personnel Management: Selected information Sources.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1979, 286 pp., $12.00.

This book, written for scholars, students, practitioners, librarians, and educators, is a selective bibliographic guide to the literature of industrial relations and personnel management. The authors, Martha Jane Soltow, Librarian at the Michigan State University's School of Labor and Industrial Relations, and Jo Ann Stehberger Sokkar, Industrial Relations Librarian at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, have collected and compiled an encyclopedic list of pertinent indices, abstracts, data bases, special collections, union lists, bibliographies, and directories available at most large academic libraries.

Since the literature of labor relations branches out into the fields of industrial psychology, labor law, public administration, business and manpower utilization, the user should adapt a cross-disciplinary approach to research. Appropriate tools in arbitration, collective bargaining, compensation, equal employment, labor history, and public employment are cited with a descriptive annotation of each. A brief section on collective bargaining and arbitration in education cites *Current Journals in Education, Resources in Education,* and *National Center's bibliographies* as well as other sources.

The user is also alerted to the many excellent services and publications of the Bureau of National Affairs, Commerce Clearinghouse, ERIC, and U. S. Department of Labor. This is a very useful guide and should be available in most academic reference collections.